

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Terry J. Poston,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 4:10-1732-TLW-SVH
)	
Wal-Mart Stores East, LP, Wal-Mart)	
Transportation, LLC, Wal-Mart Realty)	
Company, Wal-Mart.Com USA, LLC,)	
Wal-Mart Stores East, Inc., Wal-Mart)	
Neighborhood Market, Wal-Mart)	
Supercenter, Wal-Mart Associates, Inc.,)	
Wal-Mart Real Estate Business Trust,)	
Wal-Mart Properties, Inc, and Wal-Mart)	
Stores, Inc, d/b/a Wal-Mart Supercenter)	
#574,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

ORDER

On July 2, 2010, this matter was removed to this Court based on the assertion of diversity jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1332. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02 (B)(2), D.S.C.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 17). On August 30, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the plaintiff’s motion to remand, (doc. # 5), be granted, (doc. # 17). The defendant filed no objections to the report. Objections were due on September 16, 2010.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 17). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the plaintiff's motion to remand, (doc. # 5), is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

October 15, 2010
Florence, South Carolina